

- 8 -

**REMARKS**

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on November 02, 2004. Claims 1-17 and 19 are standing for examination. In the Office Action the Examiner objects to the amendments made to the specification. Claims 1-6, 15-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light et al. (U.S. 6,192,380), hereinafter Light in view of Gupta (US 6,199,079) hereinafter Gupta. Claims 7, 9-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light, in view of Gupta and further in view of Jacobs et al. (U.S. 5,611,048), hereinafter Jacobs. Claims 8, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light in view of Gupta, and further in view of Kraft et al. (U.S. 6,048,585), hereinafter Kraft.

Applicant has carefully studied the prior art references provided by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein provides facts and argument which will clearly demonstrate that applicant's claims distinguish unarguably over the prior art presented by the Examiner, either singly or in combination. Applicant also corrects the amendment to the specification to correct errors in the location of specified paragraphs.

Regarding claim 1 the Examiner states that Light discloses a method in which the job order is an instruction that is executable by the fill-in unit and the instruction includes data necessary to navigate to and register (fill-in the form) to a site (col. 3, line 30 to col. 4, line 30). Applicant's claim 1 recites the limitation of a software application having a function for navigating to the site and submitting data to a host sponsoring the site using the form associated with the site.

- 9 -

Applicant argues that Light fails to teach a software application navigating to a site. In the teachings of light a user, utilizing a browser, or by other manual means navigates to the site (Fig. 5A, col. 5 lines 37-49). There is no facility in the reference of Light capable of autonomously navigating to Web sites as claimed.

The Examiner admits that Light fails to teach a method in which user notification is returned to the user that includes the result of the form submission and registration attempt, including registration status and authentication data. The Examiner relies on the reference of Gupta to teach said limitation. The Examiner states that Gupta discloses a method in which a user notification is returned from the hosted site, which includes the results of the form submission and registration, status and authentication data. (col. 6, line 56-col. 8, line13).

Applicant points out to the Examiner the specific claim 1 limitation not being properly interpreted by the Examiner when comparing it to the teachings of Gupta wherein a software application includes a function for user notification of data that is the result of the form submission and registration attempt characterized in that the instruction order contains all of the required instruction data for navigating to and registering the user to the site, including authentication data for secure login, if required, and further characterized in that the user notification includes registration status and authentication data accepted by the hosted site.

Referring now to applicant's specification, with reference to Fig. 10, it is specifically described beginning on line 14, that the navigation server 223 is adapted by means of auto registration software, which is adapted to navigate to the target site on behalf of the user and register the user to the site or service, submitting all of the data required for site-registration, and returns accepted user-data back to domain 205. The data after registration to the site may include login names and passwords accepted for user registration at the hosted site.

However, applicant's specification specifically teaches, with reference now to Fig. 11, that that database refresh layer 237 comprises a user notification module adapted to notify a user upon successful registration and in some cases failed registration attempts. In some cases, a user may be disqualified from registration based on information such as

- 10 -

credit rating or some other criteria, and in this event, a notice would be sent to the user. A presentation module used in conjunction with the notification module is provided and adapted to present any summary or refresh data to a user if it was requested before registration, and such data may be returned to the user along with registration confirmation and log-in data.

Referring now to applicant's specification with reference to Fig. 12, a process flow diagram illustrates various process steps for auto-registration to a site and receiving data from the site according to an embodiment of the present invention. The method comprises a step 295, in which if the registration fails, an attempt to determine the reason for failure is initiated, and notification may be sent to the requesting user explaining a given reason for failure. Auto-registration of the user to the target site may fail for various reasons, which may include non-qualification of the user, or that an error has occurred with respect to a data submitted such as and invalid credit card number, for a username or login code already in use by another subscribing user, or for a variety of other reasons. If a failure notice is displayed to the navigation server by the target site or service, the notice may be parsed for content with notification sent back to the user, and the user may then be required to update the selected user profile with the correct data, or possibly select an alternative user profile and reinitiate the registration process. In step 303, if auto-registration is successful, the accepted password and login data along with confirmation of the registration status is returned to the user by the user notification and user presentation modules.

The clear and advantageous distinction of applicant's invention, as is now recited in the independent claims as amended, is that data resulting from the form submission and registration attempt, including registration status (fail/success), and if successful, accepted login username/password data, is returned to the requesting user, such that the user is better informed of the registration status, and may subsequently choose alternate user profiles or authentication data to use for auto-registration to the target site.

Applicant argues that Gupta specifically teaches the host of the website (vendor) involved in the transaction with the user sends the user notification, not the software application as claimed. The Examiner relies on portions of column 6, the entire column 7

- 11 -

and portions of column 8 of Gupta to teach applicant's simple limitation of claim 1 of returning notification to the user including the result of form submission. Applicant fails to read anywhere in the columns of Gupta, referenced by the Examiner, providing said teaching. If the Examiner is confident of Gupta's teaching then Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner be more specific when referencing Gupta.

Applicant believes claim 1 is patentable as argued above. Gupta fails to teach the notification limitations as claimed. Light fails to teach navigation by the software application as claimed. Therefore, dependent claims 2-8 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.


Regarding claim 9, the claim includes similar limitations argued on behalf of claim 1 above. The Examiner relies on the same portions in the art of Gupta and Light as used in the rejection of claim 1 to reject claim 9. Applicant argues that Gupta fails to teach the notification limitations as claimed. Light fails to teach navigation by the software application as claimed. Therefore, claim 9 is also patentable over the art of Gupta and Light. Dependent claims 10-14 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as dependent upon a patentable claim.

Applicant argues that independent claims 15 and 19 also include the same limitations previously argued on behalf of claim 1 wherein navigation and notification to the user if performed by a function of a software application. Therefore, claims 15 and 19 are patentable as argued on behalf of claim 1. Claims 16-17 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as dependent from a patentable claim.

- 12 -

As all of applicant's claims have been shown to be patentable over the art provided by the Examiner, applicant respectfully requests that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Anand Rangarajan et al.

by   
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457